DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 337 511 UD 028 176

AUTHOR Erbe, Brigitte
TITLE Parent Participation in the Chicago Public Schools.
SPONS AGENCY Illinois State Board of Education, Springfield, Dept. of Planning, Research and Evaluation.
PUB DATE 5 Apr 91
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, April 3-7, 1991).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement; *Disadvantaged; Elementary Education; Limited English Speaking; Low Income Groups; Minority Groups; Parent Associations; *Parent Participation; *Parent School Relationship; *Principals; Public Schools; Questionnaires; Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS *Chicago Public Schools IL

ABSTRACT

The relationship between parent participation and academic achievement in elementary schools is examined using statistics from the Chicago (Illinois) public schools and a survey of principals and presidents of local school councils. The questionnaire assesses the extent of parent participation in the schools. Data from initial or telephone responses from principals or school council presidents from 289 schools are evaluated in terms of the following parameters: (1) communication with parents; (2) effective parenting programs; (3) parent support of the school; (4) service to parents; and (5) total parent participation. Academic achievement is measured using scores on the Illinois Goal Achievement Program (IGAP) tests. The results show that the level of involvement between parent and school is significantly related to achievement in both mathematics and reading. The home-school partnership is a significant factor in student achievement, particularly in schools often described as disadvantaged. Six tables of statistical data, a 14-item list of references, and the survey questionnaire are included. (SLD)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED337511

# Parent Participation in the Chicago Public Schools

**Presentation at the**
**American Educational Research**
**Association (AERA)**
**Annual Conference in Chicago**

**Friday, April 5, 1991**

**Brigitte Erbe**
**Roosevelt University**
**College of Education**

**430 S. Michigan Avenue**
**Chicago, IL 60605**
**(312)341-3868**
**Fax (312) 341-3560**

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Brigitte Erbe
Roosevelt U

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

UD028176



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

This Project Was Funded By a Grant From
The Illinois State Board of Education,
Office of Research & Evaluation.

## I. Overview of Parent Participation Programs in Chicago

Reform of the Chicago public school system has empowered parents to contribute significantly to decisions that affect the education of their children. It is rooted in the belief that increased parent involvement in the schools will improve student achievement. With six parents serving on the local school council of each of more than six hundred schools in Chicago, over 3,600 parents are now participating in school governance. In spite of some obstacles, the first year of school reform thus has been successful in involving a large number of parents as partners.

The school reform effort in Chicago has focused the attention of the nation on parent involvement in the Chicago schools. Reform certainly has changed the role of parents in school governance. However, many successful parent involvement programs have existed in Chicago since the beginning of public education. Parents have been partners in the education of their children in many different ways.

The following report is a summary of research on parent involvement programs in Chicago public schools as they existed during the first year of reform. It is based on a survey that was sent to all Chicago public schools. This paper focuses on parent p[articipation in elementary schools as it relates to student achievement and other school characteristics. Data on the Chicago public schools from the Chicago Public School Data Book were combined with the parent participation survey for purposes of this analysis.

## II. Survey Methodology

A questionnaire was designed to assess the extent of parent involvement in each individual school. An effort was made in this survey to assess all types of parent involvement with the school, and parent programs were grouped into four broad categories:

A. **Communication with Parents**: Parent involvement in schools is a two-way relationship that starts by making information about school more accessible to parents. In the questionnaire, the effort of schools to communicate with parents was assessed by the following question: "Does your school have any program to improve communication between teachers and parents beyond regularly scheduled parent-teacher conferences?" Examples in this category are newsletters, home work hotlines and availability of teachers to parents.

B. **Effective Parenting Programs**: Parents are more effective partners in education when they can help their children grow emotionally and intellectually. Improved parenting skills promote healthy self-esteem in children and also increase school achievement. The extent of school

sponsored programs to assist parents in this area was assessed by the following question: "Does your school have any programs that help parents increase their children's school achievement?" Examples of this kind of parent involvement program are parenting skills workshops, workshops related to homework, or workshops related to academic subjects for parents (reading, writing, math etc.).

C. **Parent Support of the School**: There are many ways in which parents support public education beyond serving as members of the local school council. Parents serve as volunteers in and out of the school, they organize fund raising projects, and they offer both time and resources in support of their school. The extent of tangible parent support to the school was assessed with the following question: "Does your school currently have any programs in which parents actively support the school?"

D. **Social Services for Parents**: In some schools with a large proportion of poor, single parent families schools coordinate efforts to assist families with other than narrowly educational problems. The extent of parent support services provided by schools was assessed in the survey through the following question: "Does your school currently have programs that provide services to support parents in any of the following ways?" Examples include after school care, referral to social service agencies, distribution of food or clothes, adult literacy or ESL classes and support groups for parents with specific needs.

Responses to these questions were coded on a scale ranging from 0 to 3, with 0 indicating no programs in that category, and 3 reflecting multiple programs involving a large number of parents.

In addition to these questions, which were included in questionnaires both for principals and LSC presidents, principals were asked about sources of funding for parent participation programs. Funding for three types of funding sources, categorical programs, discretionary funds and external grants, was coded on a four-point scale in which 0 reflects no funds allocated, and 3 indicates extensive funding from that source. Plans for future parent involvement programs were also described. A copy of the questionnaire is a attached.

## III. Survey Results

The survey was mailed to all principals and LSC presidents of Chicago public elementary schools. One third of the schools which did not respond initially were selected as "sample schools," and an effort was made to obtain information from them by follow-up phone calls and by repeated mailing of the survey. This group provides a comparison with schools that returned the survey without prompting. If the sample group proves to be similar to the "free response" group in this survey, we can assume with greater confidence that survey results reflect all public schools.

Information obtained from the parent involvement survey was combined with other information about each school. Information on school characteristics and student achievement for the 1988-89 school year was available for 523 elementary schools. Free responses were received from principals and/or LSC presidents from 215 schools, and 74 responses were obtained over the phone or as a result of phone contact with the principal. Information is available on 55% of elementary schools.

Table 1 at the end of this chapter shows a comparison of school characteristics for "no-response," "free-response" and sample schools. Clearly, the three groups of schools are almost identical in size, socioeconomic and ethnic composition. Reading scores in non-responding schools are slightly lower than in schools from which a response was obtained.

Parent involvement activities in "sample" schools are slightly but consistently higher than in "free response" schools. This is somewhat surprising, as non-respondents in mail surveys are usually less interested in the topic surveyed. The small difference may be due to the fact that the phone interview conducted in a significant percentage of sample schools was more likely to solicit information than responses to a questionnaire filled out hastily during the last week of school or during the summer.

Overall, differences between sample and non-sample schools are small enough to warrant combining them into one group. Because of the similarity in school characteristics of non-responding and responding schools, it is fair to conclude that the results of this survey can be generalized to the elementary schools in the city as a whole. Since sample schools have slightly higher levels of parent participation than schools who responded voluntarily to our survey, it is likely that responses are not biased in favor of schools with high levels of parent involvement. Thus, schools from which no information is available are likely to have as much parent involvement as represented in our survey results.

## A. Communication with Parents

Table two compares school characteristics of schools with low, moderate and high levels of communication with parents (only four schools indicated no special efforts at communication beyond the required minimum). Forty eight schools were categorized as making extraordinary efforts in communicating with parents, 135 schools provided several different efforts at improving communication with parents, and 98 schools checked only one or two programs involving a small number of teachers and staff.

Differences between "high communication" schools and those in the other two categories are interesting: "High communication" schools have a higher percentage of black students (79% compared to 56% and 58%), a smaller percentage of white and Hispanic students, and a significantly higher degree of

student mobility (57% compared to 36% and 37%). The percent of low income students in all three types of schools is about the same.

Because of the high percentage of black students, these schools are not typically magnet schools. They are located in areas of high instability, with a highly mobile student population.

Nevertheless, these schools show higher average reading achievement scores than schools in which communication with parents was categorized as moderate or low. (To obtain a single score for reading achievement, available tests for 3rd, 6th and 8th grade were averaged). The differences in Illinois Goal Achievement program (IGAP) scores between low and high communication schools is fourteen points, an educationally significant difference. (IGAP is normed so that the state's median sore on each test is 250). Clearly, the effort to involve parents through providing information and making school and teachers accessible pays off in student achievement.

Even more striking are the differences in other parent involvement scores between these groups of schools. "High communication" schools also offer significantly more parenting effectiveness programs, they have a very high level of parent support (2.65 on a 0-3 scale), and they provide significantly more social services to parents. They also use more funding to support parent involvement in all three funding categories: categorical funds (e.g. Chapter I, bilingual, special education etc.), discretionary funds and outside grants.

Table 2 provides some statistical support to a hunch that was developed talking to principals, LSC presidents and parents as part of our survey: Some schools have a climate that is much more supportive to parent involvement than others. This climate is reflected in an openness of the principal and the school staff toward parents, an effort to make them welcome in the school and an attitude of respect for parents as partners in the educational enterprise.

Where the principal, teachers and school staff make a concerted effort to reach out to the parents, parents reciprocate by supporting the school through volunteering time and resources, they participate actively in the effort to provide a better education for their children, and children are more likely to succeed.

### B. Effective Parenting Programs

Many schools provide workshops for parents that are aimed at increased parenting effectiveness. Such workshops may deal with many different topics, often related to school and homework, but also to effective parenting in a broader sense.

Schools that provide the greatest number of such parenting programs (49 schools), score lower in reading achievement than schools that offer none (56 schools) or those that offer only a small number of programs. Schools that offer no

parenting programs have an average IGAP reading score of 216, schools with the largest number of programs have an IGAP score of 193.

This result requires further investigation before it can be interpreted correctly. There are some hints in the data that may provide an explanation: There are significant differences in ethnic and income composition and in mobility rates between schools that do and do not provide parenting programs. Schools with no parenting programs have a high percentage of white students (25% compared to 5% in the high category), a much lower percentage of low-income students (59% compared to 86%), and a much lower mobility rate (33% compared to 61%).

Magnet schools and schools in more affluent neighborhoods clearly do not see a need to provide parenting workshops. Thus, it is possible that such programs are effective where they exist, but they are not able to make up for the difference in achievement between students attending these schools. The existence of parent support programs may only be an indicator of a school in a troubled neighborhood providing a needed service.

It is, of course, also possible that many parenting programs themselves are not highly effective. Some of the intensive programs described in our brochure have a high success rate, including data on student achievement. Other parenting programs may reflect an attitude of condescension toward parents. In looking through individual questionnaires, the small number of parents attending workshops offered in some of the schools is worth noting.

Probably both of these explanations are partially true, especially since all the other indicators of parent involvement are to some extent positively related to student achievement.

### C. Parent Support of the School

Whether or not parents support their school through contribution of time or resources is less dependent on the socioeconomic, ethnic and income composition of the school than other indicators of parent involvement. There are only four schools that report no parent support; there are 75 schools with low, 131 with moderate and 69 schools with high levels of parent support. Schools in the high parent support category have a slightly larger percentage of black students than those in the low parent support group (64% compared to 61%). The percentage of low-income students is quite similar, and high parent support schools have a higher mobility rate than those with low parent support (50% and 38%).

Although socioeconomic indicators would seem to favor schools with low levels of parent support to some extent, schools with high levels of parent support have significantly higher reading achievement, with an average IGAP score of 212 compared to 195, a significant 17 point difference.

Schools that are supported by parents also have the highest indicators of other parent involvement, most significantly, perhaps, they have the highest level of communication with parents. Clearly, support in these schools is mutual, and these appear to be schools with a positive school climate. Neither the racial composition nor the income level of a school are good predictors of parent support.

### D. Service to Parents

As might be expected, the extent to which a school provides social services in support of its parents is directly related to the socioeconomic composition of that school. Schools with high levels of service have high poverty rates (87% compared to 56% in schools with no services), extremely high mobility rates (65% compared to 29%), and they have a higher percentage of black students and a lower percentage of white students.

The 37 schools that do not report any social services for parents have the highest IGAP score (227). However, the 40 schools that provide a high level of service have the second highest IGAP in reading, 210, higher than schools with low and moderate levels of service. High service schools also have very high levels of parent involvement generally.

Although the help these schools provide for parents in obtaining needed services probably enhances student achievement to some degree, it is more likely that this indicator is reflective of a school with a climate of caring, a school that works in spite of the difficulties faced by its parents.

It appears that our survey points to three indicators of an effective school: a high level of communication with parents, parent support of the school, and the provision of social services for parents in need. Schools with this pattern of parent involvement promote student achievement in spite of high rates of poverty and student mobility. They are exceptional schools, in each case representing fewer than 20% of the schools that responded.

### E. Total Parent Participation: Multiple Regression

Multiple regression analysis confirms the zero-order results described above and shows parent participation to be a rather robust variable. The effects of parent participation remain statistically significant when adding a variety of socioeconomic variables as well as attendance and level of per pupil expenditures into the equation.

For the purpose of this analysis, scores on all four parent involvement variables were added to form a scale that could potentially range from 0 to 12. The dependent variable remains the school's average IGAP reading score, and the following variables are independent variables:

Average daily attendance (percent)
Percent of students black
Student mobility rate (percent of students leaving and entering school after first month of school year)
Percent of students in Chapter I program
Percent of students classified as low income
Per pupil expenditures of school

Table 6 shows parent participation remains a significant predictor of reading scores (significance of T is .05) when combined with percent of low income students, percent of black students, and student mobility (the three demographic variables most highly correlated with school achievement). It is the only positive variable in that group, with a beta value of .08 -- in comparison the beta value for percent black is -.10.

All of the independent variables, including parent participation, show a similar relationship to the IgAP mathematics score. The significance level of parent participation in this equation is slightly higher than when reading is the dependent variable. It is probably not good to interpret this fact; it is, however, consistent with the fact that mathematics achievement is more easily improved through school intervention than reading achievement.

When attendance and per pupil expenditures are added to the equation, parent participation remains significantly related to reading achievement, although neither percent black nor student mobility remain significant variables. The value of beta for parent participation is .08; the beta for expenditures is about twice that size, .16, and the beta for attendance is .25.

Thus, there is no doubt that the level of involvement between parents and school does make a significant difference in student reading achievement in Chicago public elementary schools.

## IV. Conclusion

The description of successful programs in some of these schools may help other schools increase parent involvement and student achievement. Clearly, our data show that a home-school partnership is one significant factor in student achievement, particularly in schools that are often described as "disadvantaged."

The most important ingredient for a successful school-parent partnership was summarized best in our survey by one principal and one parent.

> Our staff is encouraged to treat parents with respect, dignity, understanding and caring.
>
> They make us feel needed and appreciated.

**Table 1**

**COMPARISON OF SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDING AND NONRESPONDING SCHOOLS**

| School Characteristics | All Schools | No Response | Free Response | Sample Schools |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Enrollment | 574 | 574 | 575 | 572 |
| Percent White | 14 | 14 | 14 | 12 |
| Percent Black | 61 | 61 | 61 | 60 |
| Percent Hispanic | 22 | 22 | 22 | 26 |
| Percent Asian | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| Percent ELP | 10 | 9 | 9 | 12 |
| Percent Low Income | 75 | 74 | 76 | 78 |
| Percent Mobility | 40 | 40 | 40 | 42 |
| Average IGAP, Reading | 202 | 199 | 204 | 205 |
| Percent Reading Above 50th Percentile | 33 | 32 | 34 | 34 |
| Parent Activities* | | | | |
| Communication with Parents | 1.82 | -- | 1.76 | 2.00 |
| Effective Parenting Programs | 1.40 | -- | 1.30 | 1.69 |
| Parent Support of School | 1.94 | -- | 1.92 | 2.00 |
| Social Sevices for Parents | 1.42 | -- | 1.37 | 1.59 |
| Financing of Parent Involvement Programs* | | | | |
| Categorical Programs | 0.82 | -- | 0.82 | 0.81 |
| School Discretionary Funds | 0.51 | -- | 0.48 | 0.57 |
| External Grants | 0.24 | -- | 0.21 | 0.32 |
| NUMBER OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS | 523 | 234 | 215 | 74 |

* Responses in questionnaire were coded to reflect the extent of parent involvement activities and the number of parents involved, "0" indicating no programs/activities to "3" indicating extensive parent involvement.

## Table 2

### COMMUNICATION WITH PARENTS: ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

| School Characteristics | None | Some | Medium | High |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Enrollment | | 611 | 611 | 384 |
| Percent White | | 16 | 13 | 7.6 |
| Percent Black | | 56 | 58 | 79 |
| Percent Hispanic | | 23 | 24 | 11 |
| Percent Asian | | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Percent ELP | | 10 | 11 | 5 |
| Percent Low Income | | 75 | 77 | 77 |
| Percent Mobility | | 36 | 37 | 57 |
| Average IGAP, Reading | | 199 | 206 | 213 |
| Percent Reading Above 50th Percentile | | 32 | 34 | 38 |
| Parent Activities* | | | | |
| Effective Parenting Programs | | 1.02 | 1.31 | 2.40 |
| Parent Support of School | | 1.53 | 1.98 | 2.65 |
| Social Sevices for Parents | | 1.01 | 1.42 | 2.24 |
| Financing of Parent Involvement Programs* | | | | |
| Categorical Programs | | 0.77 | 0.78 | 0.97 |
| School Discretionary Funds | | 0.40 | 0.43 | 0.87 |
| External Grants | | 0.18 | 0.24 | 0.30 |
| NUMBER OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS | | 98 | 135 | 48 |

* Responses in questionnaire were coded to reflect the extent of parent involvement activities and the number of parents involved, "0" indicating no programs/activities to "3" indicating extensive parent involvement.

## Table 3

### EFFECTIVE PARENTING WORKSHOPS: ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

| School Characteristics | None | Some | Medium | High |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Enrollment | 548 | 575 | 668 | 462 |
| Percent White | 25 | 14 | 10 | 5 |
| Percent Black | 52 | 61 | 58 | 76 |
| Percent Hispanic | 17 | 21 | 30 | 16 |
| Percent Asian | 5 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| Percent ELP | 8 | 9 | 13 | 9 |
| Percent Low Income | 59 | 75 | 85 | 86 |
| Percent Mobility | 33 | 34 | 41 | 61 |
| Average IGAP, Reading | 216 | 209 | 192 | 193 |
| Percent Reading Above 50th Percentile | 39 | 36 | 29 | 31 |
| Parent Activities* | | | | |
| Communication with Parents | | | | |
| Parent Support of School | 1.47 | 1.69 | 1.81 | 2.50 |
| Social Sevices for Parents | 1.57 | 1.79 | 2.01 | 2.58 |
| | 0.83 | 1.15 | 1.58 | 2.42 |
| Financing of Parent Involvement Programs* | | | | |
| Categorical Programs | | | | |
| School Discretionary Funds | 0.62 | 0.75 | 0.92 | 0.97 |
| External Grants | 0.35 | 0.43 | 0.43 | 0.91 |
| | 0.15 | 0.23 | 0.30 | 0.23 |
| NUMBER OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS | 56 | 105 | 69 | 49 |

* Responses in questionnaire were coded to reflect the extent of parent involvement activities and the number of parents involved, "0" indicating no programs/activities to "3" indicating extensive parent involvement.

## Table 4

### PARENT SUPPORT OF SCHOOL: ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

| School Characteristics | None | Some | Medium | High |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Enrollment | | 570 | 611 | 501 |
| Percent White | | 11 | 15 | 11 |
| Percent Black | | 58 | 61 | 64 |
| Percent Hispanic | | 27 | 20 | 21 |
| Percent Asian | | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Percent ELP | | 12 | 9 | 10 |
| Percent Low Income | | 80 | 73 | 77 |
| Percent Mobility | | 38 | 36 | 50 |
| Average IGAP, Reading | | 195 | 207 | 212 |
| Percent Reading Above 50th Percentile | | 30 | 35 | 37 |
| Parent Activities* | | | | |
| Communication with Parents | | 1.42 | 1.78 | 2.37 |
| Parent Support of School | | 1.02 | 1.21 | 2.18 |
| Social Sevices for Parents | | 1.04 | 1.28 | 2.14 |
| Financing of Parent Involvement Programs* | | | | |
| Categorical Programs | | 0.77 | 0.80 | 0.92 |
| School Discretionary Funds | | 0.33 | 0.45 | 0.75 |
| External Grants | | 0.21 | 0.25 | 0.24 |
| NUMBER OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS | 4 | 75 | 131 | 69 |

* Responses in questionnaire were coded to reflect the extent of parent involvement activities and the number of parents involved, "0" indicating no programs/activities to "3" indicating extensive parent involvement.

## Table 5

### SOCIAL SERVICE TO PARENTS: ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

| School Characteristics | None | Some | Medium | High |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Enrollment | 526 | 573 | 689 | 403 |
| Percent White | 24 | 15 | 9 | 6 |
| Percent Black | 52 | 62 | 57 | 72 |
| Percent Hispanic | 19 | 18 | 30 | 20 |
| Percent Asian | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| Percent ELP | 8 | 9 | 12 | 10 |
| Percent Low Income | 56 | 74 | 84 | 87 |
| Percent Mobility | 29 | 34 | 41 | 65 |
| Average IGAP, Reading | 227 | 204 | 192 | 210 |
| Percent Reading Above 50th Percentile | 44 | 34 | 28 | 38 |
| Parent Activities* | | | | |
| Communication with Parents | 1.52 | 1.62 | 1.89 | 2.60 |
| Effective Parenting Programs | 0.65 | 1.16 | 1.44 | 2.78 |
| Parent Support of School | 1.65 | 1.70 | 2.05 | 2.78 |
| Financing of Parent Involvement Programs* | | | | |
| Categorical Programs | 0.51 | 0.75 | 0.89 | 1.12 |
| School Discretionary Funds | 0.37 | 0.38 | 0.51 | 0.97 |
| External Grants | 0.22 | 0.22 | 0.27 | 0.20 |
| NUMBER OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS | 37 | 126 | 74 | 40 |

* Responses in questionnaire were coded to reflect the extent of parent involvement activities and the number of parents involved, "0" indicating no programs/activities to "3" indicating extensive parent involvement.

## Table 6

### Multiple Regression:

**Equation 1**

Dependent Variable: Average IGAP Reading Score

| Indepedent Variables | B | Beta | Significance of T |
|---|---|---|---|
| Percent Low Income | -1.00 | -.63 | .00 |
| Student Mobility | - .47 | -.19 | .00 |
| Percent Black | | - .10 | -.10 .02 |
| Parent Participation | 1.62 | .08 | .00 |
| Constant | | 293.27 | |
| Multiple R | .77 | | |
| F | | 89.62 | |
| Significance of F | .0000 | | |

**Equation 2**

Dependent Variable: Average IGAP Mathematics Score

| Indepedent Variables | B | Beta | Significance of T |
|---|---|---|---|
| Percent Low Income | - .98 | -.58 | .00 |
| Student Mobility | - .59 | -.22 | .00 |
| Percent Black | | - .22 | -.19 .00 |
| Parent Participation | 1.88 | .09 | .03 |
| Constant | 292.95 | | |
| Multiple R | .79 | | |
| F | | 96.83 | |
| Significance of F | .0000 | | |

**Equation 3**

Dependent Variable: Average IGAP Reading Score

| Indepedent Variable | B | Beta | Significance of T |
|---|---|---|---|
| Percent Low Income | - .73 | -.47 | .00 |
| Daily Attendance | 5.95 | -.26 | .00 |
| Per Pupil Expenditure | .01 | .16 | .00 |
| Percent Chapter I | - .26 | - .21 | .01 |
| Parent Participation | 1.54 | .08 | .05 |
| Constant | -301.25 | | |
| Multiple R | .80 | | |
| F | | 83.48 | |
| Significance of F | .0000 | | |

## Bibliography


Ascher, C. (1988, Summer). Improving the school - home connection for poor and minority urban students. Urban Review, 20, 109-123.

Berger, E. H. (1991). Parents as partners in education (3rd ed.) . New York: Merrill.

Brooks, M. G. and Sussman, R. A. (1990, Spring). Involving parents in the schools: How can "third-party" interventions make a difference? Equity and Choice, 6, 45-55.

Comer, J. P. (1987-1988, Summer-Winter). School Power: A model for improving black student achievement. Urban League Review, 11, 187-200.

Easton, John and Sandra Storey. (February 1990). Chicago Public School Data Book: School Year 1988-89. Chicago: Chicago Panel on Public School Policy and Finance.

Haynes, N. M. (1989, Spring). School climate enhancement through parental involvement. Journal of School Psychology, 27 , 87-90.

Heleen, O. (1990, Spring). Schools reaching out: An introduction. Equity and Choice, 6, 5-8.

Johnson, V. R. (1990, Spring). Schools reaching out: Changing the message to "good news." Equity and Choice, 6, 20-24.

Krasnow, J. (1990, Spring). Building new parent-teacher partnerships: Teacher researcher teams stimulate reflection. Equity and Choice, 6, 25-31.

Landerholm, E. (1988, Spring). Survey of parent involvement program activities offered at early intervention centers in a seven state area. ICEC Quarterly, 37(2), 24-29.

Landerholm, E. (1984, February). Applying the principles of adult learning to parent education programs. Life Long Learning, 7, 6-9.

Menacker, J. (1988, November). Parent-teacher cooperation in schools serving the urban poor. Clearing House, 62 , 108-112.

Rito, G. R. & Moller, B. W. (1989, Spring). Teaching enrichment activities for minorities: T.E.A.M. for success. Journal of Negro Education, 58 (2), 212-219.

Seeley, D. S. (1990, Spring). Are schools that are "reaching out" restructuring? Equity and Choice, 3, 38-43.

**Roosevelt University**
College of Education, Research and Developement
430 South Michigan Avenue
Chicago, IL 60605
(312) 341-3868

Address
Label

## Survey of
## Parent Participation in Public Schools

Please answer the following questions as well as you can by circling the appropriate letter. If you do not know an answer, please indicate by writing NA. Where numbers are requested, an educated guess is good enough and much better than no information at all. Use the other side of the page as necessary, or attach a blank sheet of paper. We welcome any comments or suggestions you may have.

1. Please indicate **all** age groups of children for which your school offers parent programs.

   a. 0-3 years  b. 3-5 years  c. Kindergarten  d. Grades 1-3

   e. Grades 4-6  f. Grades 7-8  g. Grades 9-12  h. Programs for student-parents

2. Does your school have any programs to improve communication between teachers and parents beyond regularly scheduled parent/teacher conferences? Please circle appropriate letter(s).

   a. School newsletter (Published how often during year?_____)

   b. Classroom newsletters (Sent by how many teachers? _____)

   c. Homework hotline or other homework information for parents (How many teachers participate? _____)

   d. Home visits by teachers or school staff (Please indicate conditions under which home visits are made):

   _____

   e. Phone calls to parents (Please describe conditions under which phone calls are usually made):

   _____

   f. Teachers, principal and staff available before, during or after school on a regular basis for meeting with parents (How many teachers regularly come early or stay late for meetings with parents? _____)

   g. Parents are encouraged, as a matter of school policy, to come to school and observe their child's classroom.

   h. Other special ways of communicating with parents, please describe:

   _____

   _____

3. Does your school have any programs that show parents how to increase their children's school achievement? Please estimate the number of meetings/workshops of each type during the last school year, and approximately how many parents were served during the year.

| | | # of Sessions | # of Parents |
|---|---|---|---|
| a. | Parenting skills workshops | ____ | ____ |
| b. | Workshops related to homework | ____ | ____ |
| c. | Workshops on academic subjects (reading, writing, math etc.) | ____ | ____ |
| d. | Other such programs (please describe) | | |
| | _____ | ____ | _____ |
| | _____ | ____ | _____ |

4. Does your school currently have any programs in which parents **actively** support the school? Please estimate the number of parents involved in each activity.

| | | # of Parents |
|---|---|---|
| a. | Parents volunteering in classroom | _____ |
| b. | Parents helping teachers in other ways | _____ |
| c. | Parents helping in lunch room, halls, play ground | _____ |
| d. | Parents paid as aides in school | _____ |
| e. | Parents active in PTA | _____ |
| f. | Parents helping with fund-raising projects | _____ |
| g. | Parents serving on school committees in support of LSC | _____ |
| h. | Other parent involvement in support of school (please describe): | |
| | _____ | _____ |
| | _____ | _____ |

5. Does your school provide any programs for students that are pregnant or who have children of their own? Please describe these programs briefly.

_____

_____

Approximate number of students served: _____

6. What would you say are the best times for scheduling parent meetings at your school, that is, when are parents most likely to attend? Please indicate your top three choices by marking them 1, 2 and 3:

_____ a. School day mornings ____ b. School day afternoons

____c.After school, afternoons ____ d. Weekday evenings ____ e. Saturdays

•For after-school meetings, where do you meet? a. At your school, b. in another building,

c. cannot meet after school because school closes.

7. Does your school currently have programs that provide services to support parents in any of the following ways? Please estimate the number of families that participated in each of these programs last year.

| | | # of Families |
|---|---|---|
| a. | After-school programs for students | _____ |
| b. | Adult literacy, ESL or job skill programs for parents | _____ |
| c. | Social worker to assist in locating needed services for family | _____ |
| d. | Distribution of clothes, food etc. to families | _____ |
| e. | Regular meetings of support groups for parents related to particular problems of children or adults in family | _____ |
| f. | Other services available to families in your school (please describe): | |
| | _____ | _____ |
| | _____ | _____ |

8. Have you found a particularly successful strategy for involving more parents in your school and the education of their children? Please describe what you do to encourage parents to participate more:

_____

_____

_____

9. What would you say are the greatest obstacles to greater participation by parents in your school?

_____

_____

_____

10. Does your school's Local School Improvement Plan for next year include any parent involvement programs? If so, please describe briefly. What source of funding will be used to pay for these programs?

_____

_____

Funding source(s): _____

11. Is there a particular activity for parents that you would like to see at your school in the future? Please describe briefly:

_____

_____

12. Are there other agencies in your school or your neighborhood that provide services for the families and parents of your students, either publicly or privately funded?

a. Yes b. No

If yes, please provide the names of those agencies:

_____

_____

13. Please indicate **all** sources of funding for you parent participation programs other than services provided by regular teachers and staff, and estimate the amount of money allocated for programs during the last year.

| | | Approximate Amount |
|---|---|---|
| a. | State Chapter I funds | $_____ |
| b. | Federal Chapter I funds | $_____ |
| c. | Bilingual funds | $_____ |
| d. | Special Education funds | $_____ |
| e. | Other categorical funds | $_____ |
| f. | Other local school discressionary funds | $_____ |
| g. | Local fund raising | $_____ |
| h. | Grants from public sources (state, federal). Please indicate source of funds: | |
| | _____ | $_____ |
| | _____ | $_____ |
| i. | Special grant from private sources, e.g., foundation. Please indicate source of funds: | |
| | _____ | $_____ |
| | _____ | $_____ |
| j. | Other funds. Please specify. | |
| | _____ | $_____ |
| | _____ | $_____ |

14. Do you have a successful parent participation program that other public schools might want to duplicate? If so, please provide us with the name of a contact person and a (summer) phone number. We will call to obtain additional information, and we will get your written permission prior to publishing information about your program in a resource guide on parent participation programs.

Name of program: _____

Brief description: _____

_____

Name of contact person: _____

School phone: _____ Summer phone: _____

**Thank you very much for completing this survey. Please place the survey in the enclosed prepaid, addressed envelope and mail.**

We will send you the completed report this fall, and hope information provided by other principals and LSC presidents will be useful to you.

**Brigitte Erbe**
**(341-3868)**